

**REMARKS**


Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough examination of the pending claims in the subject application. Claims 3-11, 14-17, 19-22, 25-27, 33, 35, 37-41, 44-53, and 55-97 stand withdrawn by the Examiner wherein the requirement to restrict these claims is now FINAL. The Examiner has also withdrawn claims 1, 2, 12-13, 18, 23-24, 28-32, 34, 36, 42, 43, and 54 from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species. Claims 3-11, 14-17, 19-22, 25-27, 33, 35, 37-41, 44-53 and 55-97 are now cancelled.

One basis for the claims 1, 2, 12-13, 18, 23-24, 28-32, 34, 36, 42, 43, and 54 being withdrawn is because the Examiner concluded it was not clear how the opening of the closure hub of the linkage device could receive the second end of itself. However the beginning of the paragraph that discusses Figure 31 states "Other embodiments of where the linkage device can be used where it is daisy-chained together and/or stacked are illustrated in FIGS. 31 through 33." It was Applicant's intent that the scope of the linkage device discussed previously in the application to also apply to the discussion of Figure 31. By making a species election, the rest of the application should still be considered in considering the claims associated with the elected species. There is no basis to limit viewing FIG. 31 as the Examiner has stated. Applicant believes that this should have been even further evident since it appears as though the second end has been cut thus resulting in a shorter version.

With respect to the Examiner's position that the "tampering detection device connected to the linkage device" is not shown, Applicant provides the following explanation. Though not numbered, an identification tag is shown in FIG. 31 and should have been numbered 20. It is the element shown with the marking "FL0123." The same element, shown at the same location, is illustrated in FIG. 32 but has the marking "FL1023." Furthermore, it is disclosed in the application that the identification tag also works as a tampering detection device. Thus, even though Application did not reiterate each and every use of the identification tag when FIG. 31 was specifically disclosed, the use of the identification tag as a tampering detection device is disclosed and does also apply in FIG. 31.

If the Examiner feels that any claims are still not in condition for examination, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, at the Examiner's convenience for a telephone conference at 407-926-7707.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Terry M. Sanks", is written over a horizontal line.

Terry M. Sanks, Esquire

Reg. No. 45,069

Beusse Brownlee Wolter Mora & Maire, P.A.

390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 2500

Orlando, Florida 32801

Telephone: (407) 726-7707

Facsimile: (407) 926-7720


Email: tsanks@iplawfl.com



S/N 10/635,889

Certificate of Mailing

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Response and Amendment has been furnished by First Class U.S. Mail to: Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, this 26th day of July, 2005.

  
Linda Sanders